

A STUDY OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF FRIENDLY INN'S
EXTENSION PROGRAM IN THE LONGWOOD AREA

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF ATLANTA UNIVERSITY
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SOCIAL WORK

BY

JEWEL MORRISSETTE

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

ATLANTA, GEORGIA

JUNE 1959

R 11

T 66

25
36

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Significance of the Study	1
Purposes of the Study	6
Method of Procedure	7
Scope and Limitations	8
II. ORIGIN AND GROWTH OF THE FRIENDLY INN SETTLEMENT . .	9
Origin	9
Neighborhood Settlement of Cleveland	11
Welfare Federation of Cleveland	12
Present Location and Program	13
III. FACTORS INVOLVED IN INITIATING FRIENDLY INN'S	
EXTENSION PROGRAM IN LONGWOOD VILLAGE	18
Description of Longwood Area and Village	18
Conditions in the Area	21
Obstacles Encountered in Initiation	22
IV. ACTIVITIES OF THE AGENCY IN SETTING UP THE EXTENSION	
PROGRAM	27
House to House Visitation	27
Opening Of Community Center	29
Planning with Residents	29
Work with Existing Groups	30
Participation of Residents	32
V. AN ANALYSIS OF THE ACTIVITIES OF THE AGENCY IN WHICH	
THE SOCIAL WORK STUDENT WAS INVOLVED	34
House to House Visitation	34
Tentative Planning of Program	41
Organization of the Hostess Committee	42
Community Organization Process Recognized	45
VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	52
APPENDIX	56
BIBLIOGRAPHY	65

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Significance of the Study

The distinguishing purpose of settlements has been to assist in the development of a "sense of neighborhood" among the people served, which consists of helping them to acquire an interest in and an appreciation for the local neighborhood, and a concern for its well-being, growth, and extension.¹

In implementing the purpose,

...the settlement has undertaken many things which are a continuous process - maintaining a steady contact with the people of the community, helping to promote understanding and cooperative action across all lines of division; working for better housing, health, education, and recreation, etc., for everyone; making the most of its opportunities of firsthand knowledge of its neighborhood in interpreting resources and needs of the neighborhood to the wider community of city, state, and nation.²

Friendly Inn as a social settlement in Cleveland, Ohio, has been able to provide services which have been in accord with the purposes of the settlement movement.³ Such has been accomplished through its function as a Red Feather agency "to work with the 'hard-to-reach,' by helping people in the conservation of resources, the development of leadership, and in

¹John McDowell, "Foreword and Statement of Purposes and Functions of Settlements in Cleveland," Readings in the Development of Settlement Work, ed. Lorene M. Pacey (New York, 1950), pp. 308-309.

²Majorie White Main, "The Challenge," Readings in the Development of Settlement Work, ed. Lorene M. Pacey (New York, 1950), p. 331.

³"Friendly Inn Settlement - Purpose and Functions" (Cleveland, Ohio, Friendly Inn Settlement, n. d.), p. 1. (Mimeographed.)

the utilization of time, and efforts of social services. This settlement has also been concerned with social problems which arise out of people's moving in as well as out of urban renewal housing neighborhoods.¹

In addition to its broad program of group work activities operating in the settlement building, Friendly Inn, at the time of this study, extended its services to two nearby neighborhoods - Dike area, and Longwood Village area. In the Dike community, the settlement, utilizing mainly the community organization approach, assisted the residents in their efforts to have a plan for demolition and redevelopment of the area changed to one of rehabilitation under the city's urban renewal program. In Longwood Village, a recently constructed development following demolition of the slums of the area, the settlement utilized the community organization process in initiating a group work and community organization program. This program was designed to benefit the people of the development area and the surrounding community.

While engaged in field work at the Friendly Inn Settlement, the writer had the experience of being involved in the initiation of the agency's extension program in the Longwood Village housing community. The housing development was one of three constructed by three private builders under Cleveland's urban renewal program in the Longwood community.² Longwood or Area B., as it is also called, was located in an area known as Cleveland's Central Area. This area was roughly bounded by Euclid Avenue;

¹Interview with Mrs. Elizabeth Fajen, Director (Friendly Inn Settlement, Cleveland, Ohio, October 24, 1958).

²Ibid.

East 105th Street; Kinsman, Woodland, and the New York Central Railroad; and East 18th Street.¹ The Longwood community (Area B.) was bounded by Woodland Avenue on the south, Scovill Avenue on the north, East 40th Street on the east, and East 35th Street on the west, and comprised fifty-six acres, thirty-two of which were designated for residential use. Longwood Village covered an area of roughly seven acres.²

Longwood was Cleveland's first redevelopment area and also the first housing to be constructed by private builders under the city's urban renewal program.³ Complete demolition of Longwood occurred in 1955, and the beginning of the construction of Longwood Village homes in 1957. These homes were modern, attractive rental housing units for lower-middle and middle income families.⁴

Longwood Village was developed by Messrs. James Scheuer and Raphael Silver and their colleagues (Longwood Redevelopment Corporation), and was managed for them by Bates and Springer, Inc., a property management firm. However, Longwood Village actually had two ownership divisions: "Longwood Redevelopment East," contained 200 units which were owned by Scheuer, et al;

¹Central Areas Council, Central Area Study (Cleveland, Ohio, 1942), Chapter 1.

²Interview with Mr. George E. Springer, President (Bates and Springer, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio, January 27, 1959).

³Interview with Mr. John B. Williams, Administrative Assistant (Cleveland Department of Urban Renewal and Housing, Cleveland, Ohio, January 22, 1959).

⁴Interview with Miss Emma Jean Pratt, Supervisor of Program, Longwood Community Center (Friendly Inn Settlement, Cleveland, Ohio, September 4, 1958).

and "Longwood Redevelopment West," contained 92 units which were owned by Silver, et al.¹

The other two housing developments of Longwood were known as the Terranova-Villanova Homes, also rental units, and the Longwood Community Homes, which could be purchased or rented. However, Friendly Inn's extension program was directly related to the residents of the Longwood Village housing development.²

Even though the houses of the area were new and attractive homes, there still existed north and south of them - immediately outside of Longwood - slum conditions where no redevelopment had taken place. Longwood was considered an island surrounded by conditions which had existed in the area itself before its renewal.

Among Longwood Village residents there was meager organization focused at conservation of physical resources and development of community leadership. The average tenant, in order to maintain a home in this area, was required to have at least a moderate income. It was feared that since most people of the lower middle class group are constantly striving for status, there might be a lack of acceptance on their part of services of a social agency, aimed at helping to solve problems and meet needs of the community.³ The concern as to the people's acceptance was further intensified

¹"Longwood Village Tenant Strike," (Boards and appropriate committees of the Cleveland Community Relations Board, the Cleveland NAACP, and the Urban League of Cleveland, October 27, 1958), p. 1. (Mimeographed.)

²Interview with Mrs. Elizabeth Fajen, October 24, 1958.

³Interview with Miss Emma Jean Pratt, September 25, 1958.

by a tenant rent strike in Longwood Village which preceded the completion of the community building, a part of which was to be used by the Friendly Inn extension program.

During the initial stage of work in the area, use was made mainly of the techniques and tools of the community organization process. This involved working with the people of the neighborhood to determine what they considered their needs to be, and to help them find ways of meeting them. These tasks, according to Ross, include two stages of the community organization process, "Community organization ... is a process by which a community identifies its needs or objectives, and orders (or ranks) these needs or objectives."¹

Emphasis was placed mainly on attempting to form clubs and committees to function as channels of communication and in creating among the people "a sense of neighborhood."² Initially it was not known precisely what services the neighborhood would accept or request; however, it was felt that through organization some degree of social integration might be achieved. Moreover, needs could be recognized, and efforts made to meet them. Since the purposes of urban renewal and social settlements have many common concerns, the agency felt that basic needs of the neighborhood could be met cooperative efforts.

From the vantage point of a community planning organization, urban renewal offers to the official and voluntary social services at least two opportunities to advance toward goals which are fundamental to improving the common welfare. At the same time, social work offers to urban renewal skill in dealing with people which is basic to achieving the quality

¹Murray G. Ross, Community Organization Theory and Principles (New York, 1955), p. 39.

²Interview with Miss Emma Jean Pratt, September 4, 1958.

of citizen participation the renewal program must seek.

Urban renewal's goal of rehabilitation of physical structures is one of intrinsic value to social work. The betterment of environmental conditions and the resulting corrections in housing facilities are not suggested as panaceas for social ills. However, there are immediate gains for good family living to be realized in urban renewal's removal of blight and slum conditions. Social workers should continue to be among the first to assist efforts by government and voluntary forces in any revitalized attacks on the problem of deterioration in the physical resources of the community.¹

Citizen participation is of great importance, as it is part of the workable program through which a city qualifies for Federal funds. It is equally stressed by the social work profession.

Real citizen participation is worth achieving in urban renewal just as it has demonstrated its value in the social work profession. A partnership in which urban renewal and social work are fully utilized by urban renewal will make for a brand of citizen participation that will have a real and lasting effect in creating a society both partners want to achieve.²

The writer, while having the opportunity to work with the settlement concerned with an urban renewal agency, became interested in undertaking a study of some phase of citizen participation.

Purposes of the Study

This study was concerned with situations which led to Friendly Inn's involvement in the Longwood Village program; the development of the program as could be determined by the acceptance of the neighborhood of Friendly Inn's services; and the social work and community organization techniques and methods utilized in initiating and developing the program.

¹Sydney B. Markey, "A Partnership in Urban Renewal," Planning Social Services for Urban Needs (New York, 1957), p. 43.

²Ibid., p. 43.

Specifically, the purposes were to describe the steps which led to the beginning of the program in the Longwood area, and to describe the functions and activities engaged in by the social work student performing community organization in the area.

Method of Procedure

The records of Friendly Inn were used to study its involvement in and initiation of an extension program in the Longwood Village housing development.

An interview guide was utilized in interviewing the director of Friendly Inn Settlement and the supervisor of program at Longwood Village Community Center.

An interview guide was also utilized in interviewing the administrative assistant of the Cleveland Department of Urban Renewal and Housing, and a member of the staff of the Bates and Springer, Inc., property managers of the Longwood Village housing development.

Records of the Longwood Village Community Center, Friendly Inn's extension facility, were used to determine the progress of the project and the social work methods and techniques employed. The writer was a participant observer during the initiation of the project; therefore, the writer's own records and observations were also used.

Publications of the property management, and documents of the Cleveland Department of Urban Renewal and Housing were utilized. Books and materials on community organization, settlements, and urban renewal were used as background material and to help develop a frame of reference.

The following conceptualization of the community organization process

based on phases of classroom theory was applied: (1) defining the problem, (2) securing support, (3) forming association, (4) developing a structural basis, (5) executing and administering, and (6) evaluating.

Scope and Limitations

This study was concerned with the initial development of an extension program of the Friendly Inn Settlement in the Longwood Village community, Cleveland, Ohio. The material was related to only one of three privately owned housing developments constructed in Longwood (Area B.). Certain factors which delayed the program development further limited this study.

Finally the study was limited by a period of only four months of observation and participation - November, 1958 - February, 1959.

CHAPTER II

ORIGIN AND GROWTH OF THE FRIENDLY INN SETTLEMENT

Origin

Friendly Inn, Cleveland's first chest-supported settlement, and also one of the oldest in the nation, was opened April 27, 1874, in a building on lower central avenue which had previously housed a saloon. The settlement was begun as a mission by the Women's Christian Temperance Union for the purpose of working with nearby alcoholics and their families, in an effort to bring about reform.¹ The building was located in what was known as the "old 'Haymarket' district of the 'Roaring Third'," and the district was later occupied by the widely known Terminal Tower and the Union Terminal buildings.²

Friendly Inn was founded at a time of rapid growth for the Women's Christian Temperance Union throughout the country, and the results of its rapid growth could be felt in the Cleveland community. Later, during that same year two other inns were opened with the same purpose as the original one. In the beginning these inns served only as reading rooms, giving free coffee and doughnuts to those who came. Before long, however, they offered room and board.

Eventually, the original purpose of the Inn at No. 67 Central Place, which took the name "Central Friendly Inn," underwent a change. As time went on, the Inn assumed more

¹"Manual of the Members of the Board of Governors of the Friendly Inn Social Settlement." (Cleveland, July 16, 1952), p. 1. (Mimeographed.)

²Charles T. Blake, "The Origin and Activities of the Friendly Inn," (Cleveland, January, 1959), p. 1. (Mimeographed.)

and more the character of a modern settlement house; classes for dancing, cooking, sewing, etc. were initiated. Soon the Inn catered chiefly to the immigrants who had settled here and who replaced the former denizens of the saloons which gradually decreased in number. The immigrants were generally sober and industrious.

Within the same year, 1874, the Inn expanded to include No. 69 Central Place. Rent for this building was \$100 per year, and included 28 sleeping rooms (which rented for \$1.00 per week per bed), a chapel, reading room, sitting room and restaurant.¹

Shortly after the opening of the Inn, committees were organized to operate the three branches. These committees held meetings often, and served as the basis for the group known later as the Board of Governors of the Friendly Inn Settlement.²

Out of the Women's Christian Temperance Union came the Women's Philanthropic Union, which sponsored the Friendly Inn Settlement along with five other organizations in the city.

The Inn was incorporated in 1879. The statement of its purpose was revised and presented in the first annual report of the Women's Philanthropic Union by Mrs. Elizabeth Neff, Chairman, as follows:

To promote social and moral welfare by the establishment and operation of clubs, settlement houses, training homes, model tenements, summer vacation camps or farms and other social agencies in which classes shall be conducted for the instruction of youth in occupational industry, wholesome recreation and Christian ideals of good character.³

Many sizable gifts were made by such outstanding philanthropists as John D. Rockefeller, Joseph Perkins, and William Taylor. These gifts

¹Ibid., p. 5.

²"Manual for the Members of the Board of Governors of the Friendly Inn Social Settlement," p. 1.

³Charles T. Blake, op. cit., p. 5.

made possible the growth and expansion of Friendly Inn. Land was bought and a new building constructed which made possible the centralization of services formerly rendered by the three branches. However, reading rooms were still maintained in various parts of the city.¹ By 1924, Friendly Inn had again outgrown its facilities, and, after selling its building on Central Place for \$203,000., purchased the building at 3754 Woodland Avenue. The building, purchased for \$75,000., had formerly been the Excelsior Club, a luxurious club for Jewish businessmen. The building was very large and adequately equipped for a settlement type program. These facilities included a large playground, large swimming pool, gymnasium, rooms for activities, and a third floor which was used for staff living quarters.²

A Junior Board of Friendly Inn was formed in 1929, and through the years made significant contributions to various activities. By conducting rummage sales the group was able to finance various summer programs of the settlement.³

Neighborhood Settlement Association

The Neighborhood Settlement Association of Cleveland, Ohio was organized in 1948 with three agencies participating, namely, The Friendly Inn, The Hiram House, and The University Settlement. The Association was established

¹Manual for the Members of the Board of Governors of The Friendly Inn Social Settlement," p. 1.

²Charles T. Blake, op. cit., p.

³Ibid., p. 8.

to implement purposes and render services as follows:

TO PLAN programs together with agency directors through the continued exchanges of ideas, and the joint training of staff through institutes and discussions.

TO ASSIST in administrative matters, especially with regard to budgeting.

TO ASSUME the leadership in demonstrating that schools and other public facilities can be used jointly by public and private agencies, thus saving the community duplication of capital expenditures and operating and maintenance expense.¹

Later other agencies became participating members - Mt. Pleasant Community Centers, Glenville Community Center, League Park Neighborhood Center, and the Garden Valley Neighborhood House. An Association office was opened in the Friendly Inn building, and an executive director was employed.²

Welfare Federation of Cleveland

The Friendly Inn Settlement was a member of the Welfare Federation of Cleveland, Ohio, which was described as follows:

...a voluntary association which brings together Greater Cleveland's health, welfare, recreation and civic organizations for joint planning and action. It provides the medium - the meeting ground - through which all such agencies, whether supported by taxes or voluntary contributions, and other organizations interested in these fields, may work and plan together to serve most adequately and economically the needs of all people in the community.³

¹"Manual for the Members of the Board of Governors of the Friendly Inn Social Settlement." p. 12.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., p. 24.

At the time of this study, the Welfare Federation was composed of 210 member organizations, and while the federation was itself supported by community chest funds, only ninety-six of the member organizations were Red Feather agencies. Thirty were tax-supported. Eighty-four were privately supported organizations. Friendly Inn was a Red Feather agency which received funds through the federation.

The member organizations of the Welfare Federation were divided into five councils. Friendly Inn being basically a group work agency was a member of the Group Work Council, which was created in 1935.

This Council was:

...Composed of agencies and organizations in Cuyahoga County which are engaged in the conduct of programs of group work and recreation, or are interested in the promotion of more adequate community services in this field.¹

Present Location and Program

After Friendly Inn had rendered social services to the Woodland Avenue community for nearly three decades, the agency's facilities were in great need of renewal and repair. On December 7, 1953, the City of Cleveland Division of Building and Housing served Friendly Inn a notice, pointing out a large number of violations of building ordinances. The Friendly Inn Board of Governors, and the Women's Philanthropic Union (owners of the property), felt that the estimated \$15,450., cost of having the building repaired to comply with code standards would be too great for such an old building.

¹By-Laws of the Group Work Council of the Welfare Federation of Cleveland, Ohio, February 1, 1952, p. 1. (Mimeographed.)

The two organizations began making plans to purchase a new site for the settlement.¹

During the course of Friendly Inn's search for another building which it could purchase, or a location where it could construct a new building, an invitation was extended by the Cleveland Metropolitan Housing Authority "to move the major part of Friendly Inn's operations into the Carver Park Community Building."² The Carver Park Housing Estate was a public housing project with a community building. In this building the Cleveland Board of Education had conducted a recreational program, but had planned to discontinue it during June of 1954. The Carver Park community was near Woodland Avenue, and had been partly served by Friendly Inn from its Woodland Avenue location.

Friendly Inn accepted the Housing Authority's offer of building facilities to house the settlement program, and the two agencies began planning together for Friendly Inn's occupancy of the building. A lease was drawn up, changes had to be made in the physical structure of the building, and an agreement reached as to the function of Friendly Inn in the neighborhood.

A March 23, 1954, letter from the executive director of the Neighborhood Settlement Association to the chairman of the budget committee of the Cleveland Welfare Federation stated that "Friendly Inn Settlement, one of the member agencies concluded an agreement with the Metropolitan Housing Authority." A statement of the agreement was made as follows:

...whereas, starting August 1st, 1954, Friendly Inn, would occupy most of the community building located in the

¹Records from the files of the Friendly Inn Settlement, Cleveland, Ohio.

²Ibid.

Carver Park Public Housing Project. The agreement will provide for rent-free occupancy, with Friendly Inn reimbursing the Cleveland Metropolitan Housing Authority for utilities and being responsible for the in-door maintenance of the building. At the same time, the Women's Philanthropic Union, owner, of the Friendly Inn building and the legal parent agency of Friendly Inn, has sold the Friendly Inn building to the Northern Ohio Food Terminal for the sum of \$50,000., to be paid, on a note, after one year.

In making this change of location, Friendly Inn assumes the responsibility for settlement services not only to the people in its new neighborhood, but also for the continuation of as many services as possible to the old neighborhood which it has served for the last thirty years. This improvement and extension in services is an essential part of the whole plan of relocation, and it must therefore be understood by all concerned that any reduction in operating maintenance costs must and will be used toward defraying the additional expenses involved in the enlarged program. For that reason, the Board of Trustees of the Neighborhood Settlement Association will in no way reduce its allocations to Friendly Inn for 1954, and will continue its 1955 requests on behalf of Friendly Inn on that essential basis without which the move would not and could not have been made.¹

Assistance of the Welfare Federation of Cleveland was sought. The Neighborhood Settlement Association requested a loan of \$10,000., free of interest, for the purpose of making the alterations which were felt to be necessary to prepare the Carver Park building for use by Friendly Inn, to be repaid by the Women's Philanthropic Union from the sale of the old building (\$50,000.). The remainder of the money was to be invested.²

The Neighborhood Settlement Association office could no longer be housed in the Friendly Inn building, since there was not enough space

¹Ibid., March 23, 1954.

²Ibid.

in the Carver Park Estate building. It was moved to the Welfare Federation building at 1001 Huron Road.¹

It was felt by the Friendly Inn Board of Governors that the settlement's move from 3754 Woodland left an area of great need unserved. Some steps were taken by the Board of Education to fill this gap for the children, while many of the teen-agers and adults became members of Friendly Inn in its new location. The Unmet Needs Committee of the Group Work Council was asked by the Board of Governors to study the situation. The Board would then make an effort to comply with the committee's recommendations. It was felt that upon the completion of an urban renewal redevelopment project in Area B. (across the street from Friendly Inn's Woodland Avenue site), that Friendly Inn would extend its services to the new community.²

Later Friendly Inn's services were extended to include Area B. and the Dike Area, also slated for redevelopment.

Dike Area was so called because it is the neighborhood surrounding the Dike Elementary School, but was designated by city officials as Area K. in the urban renewal program. Friendly Inn's first contact with the Dike Area came as the result of having placed a worker in the school to be used in working with families of the children and in the school's afternoon program of activities. The area is bounded by E. 55th Street on the west, East 64th Street on the east, Quincy on the north, and Woodland on the south.³

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., July 16, 1952.

³Rosamond Hatton, "Evaluation of the Dike Area Project," (Cleveland, Ohio, Friendly Inn Settlement, September 1957 - June 1958). (Mimeographed.)

At the same time that the area across from the old building (Area B.) was declared an Urban Renewal area (complete demolition) a seven square block area (called Area K.) near Dike School was also marked for clearance. The home owners in this area were so opposed to this decision and protested so loudly that the city dropped any idea of going through with their original plans. The residents of Area K... formed A People's Community organization and this organization has been trying for several years to do something to make the area a better community. There was a plan underway to remodel ten houses as a pilot project and around this a meeting with Mr. Lister (Director Urban Renewal and Housing) had been arranged. It was at this point that Friendly Inn became interested in this effort of citizens trying to do something to improve their neighborhoods.¹

The residents of the Dike Area expressed a desire to have the area officially declared one for rehabilitation rather than for demolition and redevelopment. Friendly Inn provided them with a neighborhood worker to serve as a guide, and an enabler in working toward this goal.²

As part of the overall renewal plan for the Dike Area, the president of the People's Community Club, the Dike Area neighborhood worker from Friendly Inn, and the Friendly Inn director, met and discussed the importance of involving the citizens in the total planning for the area. It was agreed that the best way to get this participation would be through neighborhood block clubs. Definite steps were made to help the residents form such clubs.

Since this was a study of the development of Friendly Inn's extension program in the Longwood area, the remaining chapters will be devoted to information dealing with the development of Friendly Inn's extension program in the Longwood area.

¹Ibid.

²Ibid.

CHAPTER III

FACTORS INVOLVED IN INITIATING FRIENDLY INN'S EXTENSION PROGRAM IN LONGWOOD VILLAGE

Description of Longwood Area and Village

When it became known that the Longwood area would be redeveloped, interested social agencies began to discuss the need for services in the area. Because of its long history and quality of service to residents in the area, Friendly Inn, in spite of the possibility that it might be ~~relocated~~ in the near future, was asked to consider the possibility of its providing the necessary services to the area through an extension program.

The development of Area B., "a section comprising 56 gross acres," by private builders was an experiment by the city of Cleveland to determine how successful this type of housing in cooperation with the urban renewal program would be.

It is Cleveland's first "urban redevelopment" project under the Housing Act of 1949. The area is being cleared and rebuilt principally for housing, along with a shopping center, recreation areas, and expanded room for an existing elementary school, three existing institutions.¹

Before any definite plans were made for the area, bids were submitted to the City Planning Commission for its consideration. Even though the highest of three bids was made by the Longwood Redevelopment Corporation, "members of the planning and Renewal Agency staffs encouraged the bidders to make the unusual request that all three be allowed to share the land

¹Planning in Cleveland Cleveland: Cleveland City Planning Commission, 1958, p. 25.

and its development." A solution was adopted which noted:

...there is a wide variance in the type of apartment construction proposed for the residential parcels, and excellence in each (type) ...and that the three bidders have jointly proposed that a better development of the area would result from the division of the project area among the three bidders, thereby securing variety of structures and accommodations, and creating a spirit of rivalry in the early completion of construction schedules.¹

Of the three bidders, only one included plans to provide facilities for social growth of the community. The executive director of the Neighborhood Settlement Association, in a letter to one of the officials of the Longwood Redevelopment Corporation discussed his interest in the proposal the corporation made:

You may remember that we had the pleasure of meeting at the hearing before the City Planning Commission, almost two years ago, when that body discussed the offers submitted by you and two other builders for the rebuilding of the Longwood Area. At that time, I abandoned the "neutrality" usually expected of organizations like mine, and spoke as I could in favor of the whole contract being awarded to your organization. In doing so, I pointed out that your plan alone made provisions for community facilities and therefore for community social services. I also tried to impress the City Planning Commission with the fact that both community facilities and community social services would be definitely and desperately needed in order to make this project not just a piece of land covered with new buildings, but was aware of the fact that you are building for people.

Although I was deeply disappointed that the project was split among three builders, I was delighted when our common friend, ..., approached me, on your behalf with the suggestion that our organization provide the needed community services in at least your part of the project.²

Attempts were made to have citizens participate in the physical planning for Area B. before its demolition, through the work of various social

¹Ibid., p. 26.

²Letter from Executive Director Henry B. Ollendorff (Neighborhood Settlement Association, Cleveland, Ohio, December 15, 1958).

agencies. These included such organizations as the Cleveland Welfare Federation, the Neighborhood Settlement Association, Central Area Council, block organizations, County Welfare Department - all divisions. A major portion of the work was performed through speeches in the churches to keep the residents informed.¹

The Urban League, Cleveland NAACP, and the Council on Inter-group Relations were kept in close contact with the people of the area to help in matters where clearer interpretation was necessary.²

Citizen participation in the social planning for the Longwood area could not take place until several months after all the physical facilities were completed. It was known from the outset that occupants of the slum housing in the area could not afford to live in Longwood Village. Planning with them would have been unrealistic. Social agencies had no choice other than waiting for the new community to come into being and from this point, hopefully, to involve the new residents in planning for the area.³

Longwood Village was attractively constructed and arranged. In addition to its 292 units and well maintained premises, there were several play areas for the children, with such facilities as monkey bars and large molded animals. There were also a public address system, outside telephones conveniently located, and an outside sitting area for adults. These were some of the features provided only in the Longwood Village area.⁴

¹Interview with Mr. John B. Williams, January 22, 1959.

²Ibid.

³Interview with Mrs. Elizabeth Fajen, February 9, 1959.

⁴Interview with Mr. John B. Williams, January 22, 1959.

Longwood Village was constructed solely for rental purposes, rent on the units ranged from \$82.00 to \$107.50 per month. If a stove and refrigerator were provided, the rent was higher.

Conditions in the Area

At the time of initial physical planning, social planning of necessity was based primarily on the predictions of social agency personnel. However, the Longwood Village builders and the Neighborhood Settlement Association did realize that service would be needed based on some prediction as to the kind of people who would live in the area. It was felt that there would be a need for avenues of communication, cultural and recreational outlets, and the continuation of residents' education along home-making lines. It was further felt that residents might want to make the neighborhood into a real community.¹

In the beginning stage, the idea to have a social agency provide services for Area B. was discussed by the builders and the Neighborhood Settlement Association. However, before such a program could be initiated, it was necessary to have the Group Work Council of the Welfare Federation study the situation in order for the extension to be approved for Community Chest funds. This having been done, Friendly Inn, because it was the closest group work agency, had originally been in the area, and had promised to reestablish some type of service to this community, was invited into the area.²

The three organizations involved in the extension program were the

¹Interview with Mrs. Elizabeth Fajen, February 9, 1959.

²Interview with Miss Emma J. Pratt, January 21, 1959.

Group Work Council of the Welfare Federation of Cleveland, the Neighborhood Settlement Association, and the Friendly Inn Board of Governors. It was necessary to present all plans to the Group Work Council, as the new program had to be approved by the Council before receiving Community Chest support. The major plans for the extension program were made by the Neighborhood Settlement Association of which Friendly Inn was a member. Friendly Inn's proposed role and function in providing services for the Longwood Community had to be approved by the agency's Board of Governors. All three organizations were to continue to function in the same manner in relation to the extension program.¹

Obstacles Encountered in Initiation

During the Spring and early Summer months of 1958, Friendly Inn began preparing to occupy the Longwood Village Community Building in July of the same year. However, this move was greatly delayed because of a strike of the Cleveland builders, which lasted through the summer. Work on the community building was not resumed until September.

On September 29, another strike of even greater concern to all agencies involved, began. Because of this, a plan to have Friendly Inn occupy temporarily one of the units in the housing development until the completion of the community building, was abandoned. Tenants began picketing the Longwood Village and many refused to pay rent.

The pickets appeared on 29 September carrying a variety of signs; calling for a 20 per cent reduction in rents, charging discrimination against Negroes in rents charged, demanding the rehiring of ..., a former superintendent, calling for the dismissal of Bates and Springer as Property

¹Ibid.

Managers, and declaring this to be a "rent strike" against the managers.¹

In spite of efforts by many community agencies to help in the solution of the rent strike, minor result was realized during the first two months.

The strike probably was the result of unrest in the neighborhood due to many reasons. The committee personnel of the Cleveland Community Relations Board, the Cleveland NAACP, and the Cleveland Urban League, who attempted to help solve the problem and did study it, agreed that some of the grievances were well founded, such as high rents, especially because of the economic recession affecting many industrial centers at this time. On the other hand efforts were made to help the people see that they were living in a private housing development, not a public one, and that rents had been set by the F.H.A. The intrusion of their rights to privacy by the employees of management, it was agreed, constituted a well founded complaint. Steps were made to correct this.²

The picketing was discontinued sometime during the month of December, 1958, and while the problem did not seem to be completely resolved, there seemed to have been a lessening of the tension. This may have been due to the moving out of some of the older tenants who were evicted because of failure to pay rents or other causes, and the moving in of new ones.³

¹"Longwood Village Tenant Strike," Cleveland: Boards and Appropriate Committees of the Cleveland Community Relations Board, the Cleveland NAACP, and the Cleveland Urban League, October 27, 1958.

²Ibid.

³Files of the Longwood Village Community Center, Friendly Inn Settlement, Cleveland, Ohio, 1958-1959.

It was the feeling that "the difficulties were caused by a complete lack, or breakdown, of channels of communication."¹ It was obvious though, that some type of organization of the community existed. The protest group, however, was felt not to be representative of the community. There seemed to have existed almost no real sense of neighborhood. It was felt by the several social agencies called into the area that a better quality of communication between management and tenants could have avoided much of the confusion which arose.²

A liability to the extension program was felt to be the small size of the community building, and the space designated for use which limited the agency's working with families.³ In the lease drawn up between Longwood Redevelopment East and West, and Friendly Inn Settlement, in reference to the size of the part of the building to be used by the program, the following was stated:

Lessor hereby leases to Lessee, for a term of one year commencing on January 15, 1959, and ending on January 14, 1960, space in its building located at 3800 Longwood Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio, which space... is more particularly described as follows:

(a) The westerly side of the basement area of said building, which said westerly side consists of a room measuring approximately 44x20 feet;

(b) An office area on the 1st floor of said building, which said office area consists of a room and storage space measuring approximately 13x10.6 feet;

(c) The Lounge area located on the first floor of said building.⁴

¹Letter from Executive Director Henry B. Ollendorff (Neighborhood Settlement Association, Cleveland, Ohio, December 15, 1958).

²Ibid.

³Interview with Miss Emma J. Pratt, January 21, 1959.

⁴Files of the Longwood Village Community Center, Friendly Inn Settlement, Cleveland, Ohio, January, 1959.

Due to the small size of the physical facility, work in the initial stage had to be limited mostly to adult activities. This seemed to have served the greater need; however, as the Cleveland Board of Education provided afternoon activities for children at the Longwood Elementary School, and the Friendly Inn Settlement was within walking distance and could serve teen-agers.¹

Another liability was that of the development's having acquired a supposed nursery with no facilities for a nursery program. As a chest-supported agency, Friendly Inn could not conduct any activity without having it meet certain health and building standards.² The decision was made to permit the continuation of the pre-school children's program in an apartment until June, 1959, at which time this service would be evaluated by the agency and the children's worker to determine the advisability of such service should more suitable facilities be available.³

At the time of the study, the reaction of the people to the extension program could not be determined. However, it was felt that there was a considerable number of people who knew about Friendly Inn, and would welcome the extension program.⁴

In ascertaining the opinions of selected individuals as to the value of a program sponsored by a private social agency in a private housing development under a city's urban renewal plan, the following were stated:

¹Interview with Miss Emma J. Pratt, January 21, 1959.

²Ibid.

³Files of the Longwood Village Community Center, Friendly Inn Settlement, Cleveland, Ohio, February, 1959.

⁴Interview with Mr. George E. Springer, February 3, 1959.

Tenants need to be taught housing pride and that they are just as responsible for neighborhood quality and prestige. They cannot be overly concerned about planning and housing and other social aspects of environment. The settlement is the place where this kind of bond can be developed by people that are there by choice.¹

We cannot dump a lot of people into high rents in the midst of a segregated slum area without having terrific social problems, and the social agency can help the "in" and "out" community see the problem.²

The value of such a program is "to establish positive channels of communication among the residents in a neighborhood or community so as to enable them to work together to handle their own problems."³

¹Interview with Mr. John B. Williams, January 22, 1959.

²Interview with Mrs. Elizabeth Fajen, February 9, 1959.

³Interview with Miss Emma J. Pratt, January 21, 1959.

CHAPTER IV

ACTIVITIES OF THE AGENCY IN SETTING UP THE EXTENSION PROGRAM

House to House Visitation

The original idea to have Friendly Inn use, temporarily, one of the Longwood Village suites until the completion of the community building was abandoned because of the tenant rent strike. Initial contacts with the residents were not begun until October 20.

Even though the strike seemed to be still in full force, it was felt that soliciting in this area for the United Appeal Drive could serve as an excellent entree. The Friendly Inn staff was responsible for soliciting funds in the drive's section 12-D. Since Longwood Village was also part of this section, the supervisor of the Longwood Village Community Center Program and the writer asked to be assigned to this area. Originally it was the plan to try to seek volunteers living in the area to help with the drive, however, due to the tension in the neighborhood, it was decided that this would be an opportunity for the workers to establish relationships in the area.¹

In addition to working with the drive, the two workers introduced themselves as workers from Friendly Inn who would be working with the community program as soon as the building would be completed. They also expressed a desire to have the residents discuss what activities they felt the program should include. It was the plan of Friendly Inn to supply as

¹Files of the Longwood Village Community Center, Friendly Inn Settlement, Cleveland, Ohio.

nearly as possible program activities to meet the **social needs** indicated.¹

Suggestions included: groups in arts and crafts, recreational activities, bridge classes, sewing classes, cooking, ball teams, adult education, and extension of the already existing pre-school services. A number had no suggestions. Some individuals either promised to begin thinking of suggestions or pledged their support of whatever groups were organized. Others said they were not interested, or they would be moving, a few seemed to have been confused about the strike, while others were quite hostile. Most of the people who talked freely, mentioned the strike, and some of them seemed to be seeking direction concerning what they should do. The workers informed the tenants that they could not become involved in the problem since they knew very little about it. Nevertheless, the agency personnel had pointed out the disadvantage of taking sides on such a controversial issue, tenants were supported in the expression of their feelings about the problem.²

Fifteen additional home visits were made on November 20 and 21, to inform other residents of the program planned, and to seek their suggestions.

The original hope to form tenants' organizations through which all complaints could be channeled from the agency to management had to be abandoned. It was decided that whenever **tenants** mentioned problems with management, the workers would suggest that they discuss these with management.

¹Ibid.

²Files of the Longwood Village Community Center, Friendly Inn Settlement, Cleveland, Ohio.

This was a decision made because of the apparent hostility of tenants toward management. If it had appeared that the extension program was an agent of management or vice versa, this might have affected negatively the effectiveness of the program.¹

Opening of Community Center

On January 21, 1959, Friendly Inn began moving into the Longwood Community Building facilities for the purpose of beginning its extension program. The workers (supervisor and student) compiled a mailing list including names of tenants, owners and management officials, Friendly Inn and Neighborhood Settlement Association board members, city officials, community church leaders, and persons of other related and interested agencies.

Members of the Board of Governors of Friendly Inn assisted the workers with addressing invitations to the open house observance. Open house was held the afternoon and evening of February 4, 1951; a total of 325 persons attended.²

Planning with Residents

For several days following the formal opening of the center, agency activities were centered in planning with the Longwood Village residents for the extension program. Mass activities were used in an effort to have residents come to the building, to facilitate the formulation of meaningful relationships between agency and community. Another method employed was

¹Ibid., January 15, 1959.

²Ibid.

work with already existing organizations in the community which were using the facilities of Longwood Village.¹

Work with Existing Groups

According to several copies of the "Longwood Villager" (small paper distributed by management), some organization in the area was apparent. As stated in the lease, the already existing organizations using the facilities, were to be supervised by the supervisor of the Community Center program. A pre-school worker was keeping children in an apartment provided by management, a children's community club was in operation, and one tenant had been working to organize a little league ball team. Management requested that these adult leaders talk with the supervisor of the Community Center program to make plans for the future of the groups.²

In the supervisor's talk with the pre-school children's worker, an agreement was made to have the worker continue working in the unit which was provided since there were no facilities for children in the community building. The supervisor was to work with the children's worker in planning. A group of mothers of the children had recently been organized. It was agreed that this group should be invited to have its meetings at the Community Center and the supervisor should be present at these meetings as a guide in helping the group with its program. The first meeting at the center was held on February 11, with ten mothers attending.

It was agreed to have the children's community club continue to meet in one of the housing development's units because of the lack of facilities.

¹Ibid.

²Ibid.

The supervisor of the center program would serve in guiding the adult leader of the group.

The leader of the proposed ball team did talk with the worker; however, it was decided that any definite planning would be done in the Spring since nothing could be done with the group until warm weather came.¹

In planning for the opening of the center, a tentative list of activities was compiled based on suggestions by the Longwood residents at the time of the house-to-house visitation. The list was in keeping with the purposes of Friendly Inn, the Neighborhood Settlement Association, and the Welfare Federation; and took into consideration the facilities available in the new building. The suggested activities consisted of the following:

- Hostess Committee
- Rhythm Dance Group
- Men's Lounge Night
- Arts and Crafts
- Special Projects Committee
- Co-ed Social Evening
- Ladies Afternoon Out²

During the first week, the residents in Longwood Village were invited to come in during afternoons and evenings for mass activities, and encouraged to enroll in the above proposed activities, and to make suggestions about the program.

The writer worked with the residents in helping to organize the hostess committee. The purpose of the committee was to arrange for teas or social hours for newcomers to Longwood Village.³

¹Interview with Miss Emma Jean Pratt, January 21, 1959.

²Ibid., February 4, 1959.

³Ibid., February, 1959.

Participation of Residents

Even though the Center was located in the Longwood Village area of Longwood, and all recruiting of membership was confined to this part of the development, as a Red Feather agency, all interested adults were permitted to participate. No membership fee was to be paid until September of the first year, at which time the participants would be encouraged to help in determining the amount of the fee.¹

TABLE 1

PARTICIPATION IN THE LONGWOOD VILLAGE
COMMUNITY CENTER PROGRAM DURING FEBRUARY, 1959

Date	February													
	4	5	6	9	10	11	12	13	16	17	19	23	24	26
Activity	Number Attending													
Open House	325													
Mass Activity		27	35	10	15	15								
Pre-School Mothers						16								
Co-ed Social Evening							10				10			10
Women's Group								7						
Mother's Club Committee									7					
Men's Night										10			10	
Hostess Committee												4		
Rhythm Dance Group												4		

¹Ibid.

Table 1 shows the number of persons who attended some activity at the Longwood Village Community Center during the month of February, 1959. At the open house observance 325 were present. February 5th, 6th, 9th, 10th, and 11th were set aside for mass activities at which time the residents were invited to come, take part in the activities, enroll for groups of interest, and offer suggestions. The attendance was twenty-seven, thirty-five, ten, fifteen and fifteen, respectively. The first meeting of the mothers of the pre-school children was held February 11th, with sixteen attending. Co-ed Social evening was held February 12th, 19th, 26th, and ten persons attended each of these activities. On February 13th, the women's group held its first meeting and seven women were present. A committee of seven met to plan for the pre-school mother's group meeting, February 16. Two meetings of the men's lounge group met February 17th and 24th, with ten persons attending each of these meetings. The first meeting of the hostess committee and the rhythm dance group met February 23, and four women attended each of these meetings.

CHAPTER V

AN ANALYSIS OF THE ACTIVITIES OF THE AGENCY IN WHICH THE SOCIAL WORK STUDENT WAS INVOLVED

House to House Visitation

In a search for some method of ascertaining information as to the needs, desires, attitudes, and interests of the Longwood Village residents, agency staff persons agreed that some means of making personal contacts with persons in the area was essential. Making such contacts, it was concluded would greatly aid in obtaining knowledge of the ways in which the resources of the agency could best be utilized. In the absence of any group in the area which could be considered representative, it was agreed that house to house canvassing would be the best method of implementing the plan.¹

Agency staff persons had throughout the years volunteered their services to the United Appeal. The worker assigned to the job of supervising the Longwood Community Center program requested that she and the writer be assigned to solicit in the Longwood Village area.

It was felt that persons in the area might be familiar with the United Appeal and would receive the volunteers with a degree of cordiality. Workers agreed that once entree had been obtained for the purpose of soliciting for United Appeal funds, it might be relatively easy for them, during the same visit, to orient neighborhood persons with the agency and to obtain some appreciation of their needs, interests, and attitudes toward the community.

¹Files of the Longwood Village Community Center, Friendly Inn Settlement, Cleveland, Ohio, September - October, 1958.

An informal approach without the use of a detailed schedule, it was agreed, might be less resisted by persons in the community. In preparation for the visits the writer reviewed literature on the methods and techniques of interviewing. Agency personnel thought this to be important, as relating positively to the community was a crucial need at that time. "In making use of the professional self and in establishing successful relationships in social work, skill in interviewing is essential."¹

The writer also made an effort to prepare for answering the questions which it was supposed neighborhood persons might ask. Further considerations included selecting a suitable time for visiting, outlining specific information desired, and selecting a means of interpreting the agency's program. Agency workers considered possible ways of handling situations in which the United Appeal would not serve as a good entree.²

In reviewing information which it was thought the Longwood Village residents might want to discuss, it was necessary as a first step to gather as much data about the strike situation in the area as was possible. This was done so as to help workers be more understanding of Longwood Village people and their problem without showing any bias. In an effort to obtain some appreciation of the needs of the community, the writer attended conferences in which related or interested agencies (Urban League, Community Relations Board, Central Areas Council, Bates and Springer Management Firm, and Friendly Inn) met to discuss the situation.

¹Campbell G. Murphy, Community Organization Practices (Boston, 1954), p. 104

²Files of the Longwood Village Community Center, Friendly Inn Settlement, Cleveland, Ohio, September - October, 1958.

The writer compiled a file of newspaper articles, and reviewed other material on the Longwood community. In addition to having background information which was needed in approaching the community, a knowledge of the number, type, and function of agencies which received support from the United Appeal was necessary. It was also necessary to have a general background knowledge about the Friendly Inn Settlement, what was to be the relationship of the extensive program to the settlement, and something of the general type of program the agency hoped the people of the area would desire.¹

In discussing plans for home visiting in Longwood Village, it was decided by the workers themselves not to begin visiting before 10:00 o'clock in the morning.

Some knowledge of the daily routine of the interviewee is essential if a proper time and place are to be chosen. ...It must not be assumed that, when dealing with workmen or with housewives, it is not necessary to consider carefully questions of convenience and convention. Even those who have time and who place little weight on convention will generally appreciate the gesture of politeness.²

The workers agreed that not more than four hours should be used in visiting in any one day. To have visited longer would have been overtaxing for the workers, and not allowed time for the recording of the visits.³

It was felt, in the beginning, that the United Appeal drive would serve as a good entree in approaching Longwood Village residents. The workers

¹Ibid.

²Pauline V. Young, Interviewing in Social Work (New York, 1935), p. 56.

³Ibid.

were to introduce themselves by name and as workers from the Friendly Inn Settlement, and to state that they were soliciting for the United Appeal. After attempting to solicit contributions, the workers were to add that they would be workers at the Community Center as soon as the building, then under construction, would be finished, and to ask the residents for suggestions about the program.

The response to the use of the United Appeal as an entree was varied. Of those who were informed about the drive, some willingly contributed, others stated that they had already given either through their jobs or their children, and some women stated that money for the drive had been taken from their husbands' pay. Of those who did not seem to be familiar with the drive, some gave willingly without question, and others demanded an explanation. Of those who had requested this explanation, some gave and others did not, stating they did not have any money.¹

Before long, however, the workers saw that the United Appeal did not prove to be as effective an entree as had been hoped. Instead of serving as an opening, in many cases it served to destroy any possibility of forming any positive relationship at the time. The problem, it was felt, may have been intensified by the economic situation in the city at the time, and anyone soliciting funds for any cause may have received similar responses.

The workers found that mentioning the proposed community center and program first, often obtained better results. The people could see the building under construction, expressed curiosity about when it would open,

¹Ibid.

and sought information concerning what its function would be. Mentioning the extension program first became the workers' technique, and better results could be seen readily. However, mentioning the fact that the worker was soliciting United Appeal funds after having established a good relationship around the extension program, was somewhat defeating to the extension program, the workers felt. They agreed that more could have been accomplished in relation to the drive if meaningful relationships had been established between the workers and the community prior to the drive.¹

After the completion of the drive, the writer continued visiting for the purpose of talking about the new program. With this single purpose, the writer's reception on the whole was more cordial than before.²

Prior to visiting in Longwood Village it was felt that most of the people contacted would know about Friendly Inn. However, the workers, in preparing for the visits, reviewed the purposes, function, and program of the agency. As was predicted, most of the persons contacted did know about Friendly Inn; some had attended the agency either as teen-agers or adults. However, there were those for whom an interpretation of the agency was necessary.³

In staff discussions of plans for contacting people of Longwood Village, it was agreed that workers would avoid discussion of the strike situation. Community organization literature suggests the refraining from focusing on

¹Ibid.

²Ibid.

³Ibid.

a bias:

Thus in the welfare community, the welfare council seeks to have identified problems which are of deep concern to all its members. It is not content to operate on the bias of needs defined by a few of its agency members, but seeks to find the areas of deep discontent in the welfare community as a whole.¹

Upon talking with the people, this rent strike problem seemed to have been uppermost in the minds of the majority of them. Almost without exception, persons contacted mentioned the strike, and seemed to be seeking some expression of opinion from the worker, and some suggestion as to what the residents should do. The writer found that the agency's suggestion of avoiding the expression of viewpoints that might be considered positive or negative, about the rent strike controversy was possible, and supported the residents in the expression of feelings relating to the problem.² This, the writer believed was an aid in establishing rapport, an important prerequisite of the good interview.

The interview proper does not need to begin until a considerable degree of rapport has been established ... Rapport implies the existence of a mutual responsiveness and may be achieved by means of showing interest, attention, ... by listening, and by meeting people on their own grounds...

After rapport is established and the conversation becomes free and easy, it is apt to travel on a tangent to the subject of the inquiry.³

In meeting needs, it is now generally recognized that one has to start at the point where people see and recognize their own needs. They may identify these needs incorrectly, but as in any process of education one begins with what people do see and understand, and proceeds from that to the unknown.⁴

¹Murray Ross, op. cit., p. 164.

²Ibid.

³Pauline Young, Interviewing in Social Work (New York, 1935), pp. 63-64.

⁴Campbell G. Murphy, op. cit., p. 78.

After establishing rapport with the residents by letting them express their feelings about the strike, it was easy for the workers to move into the discussion of the extension program. Contacting people in Longwood Village was aimed at determining from the residents what they felt the community needs to be. This aim was realized by letting them discuss the strike, which to them was a problem, and in seeking their suggestions about the community program.

Supporting the residents in the expression of feelings relating to their problem and encouraging their suggestions concerning the community center program, were in the opinion of the writer, beginning steps in helping the community define its own problem. This is a fact emphasized by Dunham when he says, "the first step in handling any major community organization problem is, normally, the analysis of the problem."¹

An understanding of the factual situation in the neighborhood was especially valuable in gaining insight into the dynamics of the community. From the information gathered, it seemed that the unrest in Longwood Village may have been caused more by persons living outside of the Village. Apparently, the management of one of the other developments in Longwood used this method in an effort to have the Bates and Springer management firm replaced. Others felt that the problem had very strong political implications. A person named in the earlier stages as the major power behind the situation later ran for councilman of the area.²

¹Arthur Dunham, Community Welfare Organization (New York, 1958), p. 270.

²Files of the Longwood Village Community Center, Friendly Inn Settlement, Cleveland, Ohio, September, 1958 - February, 1959.

In light of the facts gathered through home visits and otherwise, the Longwood Village Area was "individualized." "No two communities are alike, hence no formula for organizing group forces can be devised that can be applied with equal promise of success in any and every community."¹ Before the gathering of facts, it was thought by the supervisor and the writer that the people could be helped in the organization of neighborhood clubs and civic council groups. However, in the light of facts gathered, it was concluded that the suggestion of any groups obviously focused at community improvement would be very unwise at the time. As a result, committees concerned with neighborhood integration were suggested, with the hope that these might develop into stronger community improvement groups, such as neighborhood and council organizations.²

Tentative Planning of Program

Having determined some of the major interests of the residents in Longwood Village, through interviews with agency persons, attendance at interagency conferences, reading of materials on the area and its problem, and home visiting; the writer explored with a representative of the area council the availability of community resources to meet the needs. It was agreed that interested persons might align themselves with committees already functioning in the area and directed toward goals in keeping with the interests of Longwood residents.³

¹Wayne McMillen, Community Organization for Social Welfare (Chicago, 1945), p. 237.

²Files of the Longwood Village Community Center, Friendly Inn Settlement, Cleveland, Ohio, October, 1958 - February, 1959.

³Ibid., November 5, 1958.

Six committees were proposed: hostess committee, special projects committee, Community Christmas committee, Longwood Village Publicity Committee, Cultural Committee, and a Family **Life** committee. Of these, two were listed in the open house program along with suggested groups by way of suggesting to the residents in the beginning stage of the program, the type of program the agency hoped the people would want.¹

The writer was with the agency only one month after activities in the center began, which meant that the period of observation and participation in the new program was limited; nevertheless, the writer did help in the organization of the Hostess Committee, one of the committees which it was hoped would be focused on community improvement.²

Organization of the Hostess Committee

The writer was assigned the job of working with the Hostess Committee. This involved recruiting members for the group and in helping them in its early stage of organization. The suggestion of planning teas or other social events for the new-comers to Longwood Village was a part of the tentative plans of activities made by agency workers. These suggestions, the workers made clear, were to be evaluated, and accepted or rejected by the members. While the stated purpose was to plan teas and/or social hours to welcome new-comers, it is hoped this would help in creating a sense of need for developing a spiritual community among the people.³

¹Ibid., November, 1958 - February, 1959.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., September, 1958 - February, 1959.

The writer visited thirty homes; of these, seventeen persons promised to work on the committee. The first meeting was held Monday, February 23, 1959, with four women present. It was held as it had been planned originally, and those present were encouraged to discuss what they felt should be the purpose. Organizational structure, frequency and time of meetings, and program activity were also discussed. Those attending were asked to react to the suggested program and to make any changes they felt were necessary.¹

The committee expressed the desire to keep the original purpose, but voted to change the time of the meeting from Monday morning to Monday evening once a week until organized, after which they would change to bi-monthly or monthly meetings. The group discussed the importance of having represented on the committee persons from all sections of the Village, so that the organization would have contact with all new people moving into the development.²

In early tentative planning for a hostess committee, the agency had hopes of working with management in securing leads as to areas in which the agency might serve Longwood Village residents. The method first considered in securing names of new residents was through the management's office. Due to the rent ~~strike~~ and resulting hostility surrounding it, tenant-management relationship was at a low ebb. It was decided that in light of these facts, the agency should not identify too closely with management as this could damage the agency's acceptance in the area. As

¹Ibid., February, 1959.

²Ibid., February 23, 1959.

a result, a plan to secure names of new residents in the area from management had to be abandoned. Nevertheless, it was hoped this condition would be cleared in the future, and the assistance of management could be secured.¹

The committee elected a temporary chairman to serve until the formal election of officers. The names of persons who promised to become members of the committee but were not in attendance at this meeting were distributed among those present for the purpose of contacting them before the next meeting. This suggestion came from the committee members, and was encouraged by the writer. This group, the writer hoped, would serve as the nucleus or core group for the Hostess Committee. This, the writer felt to be basic to the community organization process, as is so vividly illustrated by Clarence King, in his analogy of the "snowball technique." "You begin by rolling a small snowball, ... once that small snowball begins to attract other particles to itself the trick is half done."²

In view of the information obtained through conferences, newspaper articles, other reports, and home visiting, the people had no defined goals of which they were aware. Efforts were made on the part of the workers to stir up discontent in the community in relation to what community agencies felt was a need to develop a sense of a "spiritual community" in the area. Stimulating discontent is one of the principles which Murray Ross points up, in stating:

Discontent with existing conditions in the community must initiate and/or nourish the development of association.

¹Ibid., September, 1958 - February, 1959.

²Clarence King, Organizing for Community Action (New York, 1948), p. 14.

...it is when the association, representing the major groups in the community, becomes deeply discontented with a situation in the community that it will find the resources and the capacity to use the community organization process in an energizing way.

Where, therefore, the association grows from the seeds of discontent with existing conditions in the community, it begins with a "common feeling" of importance and a "common wish" of some intensity.¹

The writer's work with the hostess committee was a part of implementing the principle of stimulating discontent. The acceptance by the members of responsibility for the organization was an indication that some awareness of need may have been created, and that they wished to assume some responsibility for meeting the need.

Community Organization Process Recognized

In keeping with the method of procedure for this study, certain conceptualization of the community organization process was applied: The conceptualization is delineated in the appendix of this study.

Defining the problem.-After it had been determined that Friendly Inn would assume the responsibility of extending its program into the Longwood area, the staff began a process of detailed planning. The first step in the process was that of determining what the needs and interests of residents might be, what the physical and social environment was like, and of gaining some appreciation of how Clevelanders outside Longwood Village regarded the area and its residents.

The writer's activities in the agency's problem defining phase of the planning consisted of the following:

1. Reviewing agency records which included letters and recordings of

¹Op. cit., pp. 156-159

steps taken in the initiation of the program prior to the writer's involvement with the project and summary reports to the Board of Governors of Friendly Inn.

2. Studying materials prepared by the following agencies: Cleveland Department of Urban Renewal and Housing, NAACP, Urban League Community Relations Board, and the Neighborhood Settlement Association.

3. Interviewing selected agency persons, including the director of Friendly Inn, Supervisor of the Friendly Inn Extension Program, the administrative assistant of the Cleveland Department of Urban Renewal and Housing, and the president of the Bates and Springer, Inc. (Managers of the Longwood Village Community Center).

4. Helping in the maintenance of a file of newspaper clippings concerning the area.

5. Participating in a home visiting project among the residents of Longwood Village.

6. Attending agency staff meetings, inter-agency conferences, and agency board meetings.

Through the utilization of the above methods, the problem was defined in several ways. The residents of Longwood Village expressed it as hostility between tenants and management. They complained of high rents and unfair treatment. Friendly contacts among neighbors were at a minimum. The residents also complained of a lack of something to do.

Social agency persons were of the opinion that some efforts in the area should be made toward providing an environment that would be conducive to the development of some spirit of community in the Longwood area.

A community does not exist chiefly because of formal planning and organization but through direct personal

acquaintance and relationship, in a spirit of fellowship. Its members are people who, to a considerable extent, have cast their lots together, who shared common problems and prospects, who have a sense of mutual responsibility, and who actually plan to work together for common ends.¹

Much of the attitude of the persons in social agencies was based on past experience with other new geographical areas created by urban renewal, in which the community, as described by Morgan, above, is nonexistent.

The above findings, coupled with impressions obtained by attendance at conferences, reading newspaper articles, studying other agency material, etc., led the writer to conclude that the major problem in the Longwood area might be described as a lack of a feeling of community.

Securing support.-Friendly Inn solicited the suggestions, criticisms, and comments of other agencies in the community by bringing up the matter in inter-agency conferences. As a result of this approach, some very helpful information and a considerable amount of goodwill toward Friendly Inn and its new venture was engendered from associated agencies.

In an effort to avoid duplication of services and to make optimum use of resources available through Friendly Inn's extension program, the staff consulted school persons also engaged in serving the community with group activities for children. School persons were receptive and showed considerable interest in the program Friendly Inn had proposed to undertake.

Perhaps the greatest audience was reached through the publication of newspaper articles which outlined in detail the goals, objectives of the settlement, its proposed extension of its services into the Longwood area,

¹Arthur E. Morgan, The Small Community (New York, 1942), p. 23.

in addition to a listing of program activity that might be available through the extension program.

Interviews were obtained with the heads of various religious groupings serving the community. During these interviews, the supervisor spent considerable time, in interpreting the settlement's philosophy, goals, and objectives. The supervisor went into considerable detail in explaining the function and activities of the settlement and the purpose for their existence. While considerable time was spent in making this detailed approach, it was the feeling of staff persons that the goodwill and support of the several religious leaders in the community could play an important role in the determination of community attitude toward the settlement.¹

In its effort to gain the support of community persons, the agency agreed that an investment in the preparation of a booklet giving a short history of the settlement, its philosophy, goals and objectives with a statement about its current program might be of value. These booklets were given to persons attending the open house of the extension, to persons who visited thereafter during the first month, and to persons contacted during home visitation.

The relationships established by workers while making home visits in the Longwood Village area led to the identification of persons who were later to serve as the core group for the initiation of the program.

Forming association.-There was no formal organized group that could be said to be representative of residents of the area to serve in the

¹Files of the Longwood Village Community Center, Friendly Inn Settlement, Cleveland, Ohio, 1958-1959.

administration of the program. Being an extension of Friendly Inn, this program was controlled for the most part, by the groups which controlled the settlement.

The program as presented to the residents of the area was tentative and flexible. Upon the activation of each committee, members were invited to make suggestions, comments, and criticisms of the tentative program and, within the limits established by the agency, to adjust the activities to needs and interests expressed by residents of Longwood. The organization of the Hostess Committee was an example of this procedure.

It was agreed that as leadership in the Longwood community emerged, there would be an effort to involve it in the future planning for the community program.

Developing a structural base.-Due to the short length of time the writer was involved with the new extension program, there had not been enough time for the community to develop a very strong structural base. Some of the residents of the area were participating in the agency program regularly and consistently; some were members of several groups. On the other hand, there was not a group established which could be conceived as being at the time capable of representing or controlling.

Executing and administering.-The extension program opened with the following program offerings:

MONDAY

HOSTESS COMMITTEE	10:00 - 11:30
Meet and greet new comers to Longwood Village	
RHYTHM DANCE GROUP	1:30 - 3:00
Exercise to modern dance steps	

TUESDAY

MEN'S LOUNGE NIGHT	7:00 - 10:00
--------------------	--------------

Ping pong, checkers, cards, music, beginners bridge.

WEDNESDAY

ARTS & CRAFTS 10:00 - 11:30
Leathercraft, plaster plaques, flower making, etc.
SPECIAL PROJECTS COMMITTEE 1:30 - 3:00
Plan special activities, demonstrations, forums, and holiday events.

THURSDAY

CO-ED SOCIAL EVENING
Conversation, games and dancing (refreshments can be arranged for)

FRIDAY

LADIES AFTERNOON OUT 1:30 - 3:00
For relaxation and programs planned by you.¹

The program went into operation with one paid worker, two part-time workers, and a student. The full-time worker was the supervisor of the extension program, the two part-time workers were active with evening groups, and the student was engaged in committee activity.

The open house and the subsequent mass activities for the purpose of having the residents come in, see the Center, consider suggested activities, ask questions, make suggestions, and become participating members were steps in executing the program. During the first month, of the seven proposed clubs and committees, six were able to secure at least the minimum membership required for activation. One proposed committee was unable to attract the required enrollment of six.

On examination, one might conclude that the program was not balanced,

¹"Open House, Longwood Community Center." (Cleveland, February 4, 1959). (Mimeographed.)

since services in the Longwood Community Center served only adults at the time of the study. It must be remembered, however, that duplication of services is to be avoided whenever possible. Services for children and youth were available elsewhere in the community. Activities were provided for children at the Longwood Elementary School. Friendly Inn, being nearby, could continue to serve the teen-agers.

Evaluating.-At the time of this study the extension program had only been in operation approximately one month. Consequently, the writer felt any evaluation analysis would be insignificant.

¹Frankie V. Adams, "Community Organization Processes," (Class in Community Organization 576, Atlanta University School of Social Work, Atlanta, Georgia, Spring Semester, 1958). (Mimeographed.)

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Friendly Inn, a social settlement in Cleveland, Ohio, has through the years attempted to provide services which have been in accord with the distinguishing purpose of the settlement movement - developing among the people served, a "sense of neighborhood." To facilitate this purpose, the Friendly Inn Settlement had helped people of the community in the utilization of community resources to meet their needs. This study of the development of Friendly Inn's extension program in the Longwood Area was undertaken for the following purposes: (1) to describe the steps which led to the beginning of the extension program in the area, and (2) to describe the functions and activities engaged in by the social work student in connection with the above.

The following conclusions were drawn from the study:

1. As plans were being made for Urban Renewal of the Longwood Area, likewise plans for relocating Friendly Inn were also being made, with the possibility of Friendly Inn extending its services to the Longwood Area.

2. Friendly Inn, in addition to working with the "hard to reach," assisting people in the utilization of social services, and development of leadership, was also concerned with the problems arising in the community out of urban renewal activities.

3. In addition to providing group work program for the people of its immediate community, Friendly Inn extended its services to two nearby neighborhoods, the Dike Area in which the agency utilized mainly the community organization approach, and the Longwood Village, both of which had been

affected by the city's urban renewal program.

4. The writer was involved in the initiation of the program in the Longwood Village Area. Longwood Village was one of three housing developments constructed by private builders in relation to the city's urban renewal plan of demolition and redevelopment of housing in the area.

5. During the initial stage of planning, there was no known organization of the community focused on conservation and development of leadership. On the other hand, some concern as to the program's gaining acceptance in a so called "middle class" community was expressed by agencies engaged in physical planning for the area.

6. A study of possible community need was made by the Group Work Council of the Welfare Federation of Cleveland, and a desire expressed on the part of the Longwood Village builders to have an agency use facilities of the housing development in providing social services. Friendly Inn, being the closest group work agency, having originally been in the area, and also having expressed the desire to extend its services to Longwood, was invited to provide the services needed.

7. Several factors affected the initiation of the program. A strike of the builders in Cleveland delayed the program several months. Later a tenant rent strike, which was an indication of unrest, hostility, and poor tenant-management relationship, posed issues which had to be considered in planning. The small size of the building and the part designated for use by Friendly Inn, hindered the agency's work with families.

8. Friendly Inn emphasized the importance of citizen participation in planning services to be provided. The agency made an effort to plan with other agencies of the community, and with the residents through home

visitation. Workers from the agency obtained suggestions from the people of the community concerning needs of the area, and methods of meeting these needs.

9. In an attempt to define the problem, information was gathered through inter-agency conferences, reports of studies made by agencies of the community, newspaper articles on the Longwood community and the tenant rent strike, agency staff meetings, and house to house visitation in the Longwood Village community.

10. On the basis of data gathered and analyzed in defining the problem, needs were listed and ranked in order of priority. These included mainly a tentative list of clubs and committees which had either been suggested or implied by the residents of Longwood Village.

11. Formal opening of the extension program began on February 4, 1959, with the observance of open house of the Longwood Community Center. In the open house printed program was presented a suggested list of activities based on suggestions of residents during home visitation. They were encouraged to select and become members of those groups or committees which they felt would be of interest.

12. Residents of the area were encouraged to continue their participation in planning the program through asking questions about the activities, and making suggestions about it.

13. During the first month of the extension program's operation, seven adult clubs and one committee were organized, the hostess committee. The writer was assigned the job of working with this committee. This required the recruiting of members for the committee, and functioning in an early stage of organization in a leadership capacity. The group was small but

could serve as the nucleus for the committee. Efforts were made to create a sense of need for such organizations in the community. However, the agency hoped that by engaging in the activities of such a committee designed for enjoyment, an appreciation and a desire for a "spiritual community" would develop.

14. Indication of a sense of need on the part of the members for the extension program was evidenced: in their making suggestions; in their changing certain aspects of the structure as suggested by the agency; and, in their assuming responsibility to continue the organization even though the writer would be leaving.

15. Defining the problem, securing support, forming association, developing a structural base, executing and administering, and evaluating served as the community organization approach in performing this assignment. However, the length of time in which the writer had to test the activities provided minor support of their value. Nevertheless, some indication of their usefulness was indicated.

APPENDIX

COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION PROCESSES

Community Organization must be considered as a process. A process consists of a series of actions leading to change from one status to another. Consequently, to effect the changes, definite activities must be utilized in an orderly fashion, (illustration from a mundane experience may be presented).

The activities involve (1) defining the problem, (2) securing support, (3) forming association, (4) developing a structural basis, (5) executing and administering, and (6) evaluating.

Consider under each the detail procedures, tools to be used:

1. Defining the Problem

Fact finding, here in the setting find out the characteristics, traits and needs of potential participants: Ages, number of each, occupations, distances, interests in recreation, etc., funds available, talents, skills, leadership.

2. Securing Support

Interviewing potential volunteers, leadership, locating resources including material and non-material, business men (for needed resources possible ministers, hold mass meeting - give problem, benefit of facts, contact parents and youth, solicit volunteer helpers.

3. Forming Association

To form a steering committee to ferret out the next step, (administration of program) define policies, rules.

4. Developing a Structural Basis

This group should represent groups serving and groups to be served, if at all possible. Culminate into a central body to be representative, and control group.

5. Executing and Administering

The concern here is putting the program into action. Both paid and volunteer leadership needed. Define divisions of program (well balanced) not all physical, mental, or social, athletic, crafts, or games - Boy or Girl.

Balanced in light of needs of individuals, security, belonging, achievement recognition achievement, self expression, companionship, etc. Supervision important under this step.

6. Evaluating

Recording (statistical, observers, finance)

Group Survey (small representative group may be used here)

Evaluating Sheets - **simple** forms

Purpose here is give direction for further planning or culmination.

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR FRIENDLY INN'S EXECUTIVE AND
NEIGHBORHOOD WORKER IN LONGWOOD VILLAGE.

(Was used as the interviewer's own guide in trying to get the interviewee to cover certain topics during the course of the interview.)

A. Name: _____ Date: _____

Position held at the Friendly Inn Settlement: _____

B. What were felt to be the conditions which necessitated Friendly Inn's setting up a program in the Longwood area?

Who expressed these needs?

Residents? _____ City Officials? _____

Others? _____

Why was Friendly Inn the social agency requested to serve the area?

What other agencies were asked to come in? What is the present function of the agencies?

C. What individual or organizations were involved in the setting up of the program in Longwood Village, and what was the function(s) of each in relation to the program?

Which of these individuals and/or organizations were to have a continuing relationship with the program and in what way?

D. What part did the people of Longwood Village housing development have in setting up the extension program.?

E. List the obstacles encountered in setting up the program?

List assets contributing to its development?

F. Describe the liabilities to the program.

G. Describe the value of a program sponsored by a social agency in a private housing development under a city's urban renewal plan?

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR A MEMBER OF A PROPERTY MANAGEMENT FIRM
- MANAGERS OF LONGWOOD VILLAGE

(Was used as the interviewer's own guide in trying to get the interviewee to cover certain topics during the course of the interview).

A. Name: _____ Date: _____

Name of firm: _____

B. What is the size of Longwood (Area B)? _____ Of Longwood Village? _____

When and by whom was Longwood Village constructed and by whome is it currently owned? _____

How many units are in the development: _____

How many rental units? _____

How many purchasable units? _____

Number already purchased? _____

C. What were the conditions in the area which led to the setting up of Friendly Inn's extension program there? _____

When was Friendly Inn invited to work in the area and by whom? _____

D. What was the reaction of the people of the area to Friendly Inn's extension moving into the neighborhood? _____

- E. What, in your opinion, are some of the community needs which the program should meet?

- F. Describe the liabilities to the Friendly Inn extension program.

- G. What, in your opinion, is the value of a program sponsored by a private social agency in a private housing development under a city's urban renewal plan?

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR AN ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT OF THE
CLEVELAND DEPARTMENT OF URBAN RENEWAL AND HOUSING.

(Was used as the interviewer's own guide in trying to get the interviewee to cover certain topics during the course of the interview).

A. Name: _____ Date: _____

Agency: _____

Position: _____

B. What was the relationship between the urban renewal department and the builders of Longwood Village at the time redevelopment activities in the area were undertaken?

C. To what extent did the citizens participate in planning for urban renewal?

Citizens of Area B?

D. To what extent were the services of social agencies utilized in the city's urban renewal activities?

In Area B?

E. Are there, in your opinion, advantages and/or disadvantages in private housing under a city's urban renewal plan? If so, what are they?

- F. Is there any relationship between Longwood Village management and the Department of Urban Renewal? If so, how?

- G. What, in your opinion, are some of the community needs which Friendly Inn's extension program should meet in the Longwood Village area?

- H. What, in your opinion, is the value of a program sponsored by a private social agency in a private housing development under a city's urban renewal plan?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Dillick, Sidney. Community Organization - Past and Present. New York: Women's Press and William and Company, 1953.
- Dunham, Arthur. Community Welfare Organization: Principles and Practice. New York: Thomas Crowell Company, 1958.
- Hillman, Arthur. Community Organization and Planning. New York: McMillan Co., 1950.
- King, Clarence. Organizing for Community Action. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1948.
- McMillen, Wayne. Community Organization for Social Welfare. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945.
- Morgan, Arthur E. The Small Community. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1942.
- Murphy, Campbell G. Community Organization Practice. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1954.
- Pacey, Lorene M. (ed.). Readings in the Development of Settlement Work. New York: Association Press, 1950.
- Ross, Murray G. Community Organization Theory and Principles. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1955.
- Social Work Year Book, 1957, (New York: Russell Sage Foundation).
- Young, Pauline V. Interviewing in Social Work. New York: McGraw Hill Co., 1935.

Miscellaneous Material

- A. B. C.'s of Urban Renewal. Chicago: Urban Renewal Division of Sears, Roebuck and Co., 1957.
- A Summary Report of the Relocation Plan. Cleveland: The Urban Redevelopment Agency of the City of Cleveland, (n. d.).
- City of Cleveland Application for Recertification of Workable Program. Cleveland: The Department of Urban Renewal and Housing, June 3, 1958.
- Markey, Sydney B. "A Partnership in Urban Renewal," Planning Social Services for Urban Needs, pp. 43-48. Papers on Community Organization Presented at the Eighty-fourth National Conference on Social Welfare, New York: Columbia University Press, 1957.

Planning in Cleveland. Cleveland: Cleveland City Planning Commission. 1958.

Jokiner, David. Private Development in Cleveland's Urban Renewal Areas. Cleveland: Urban Renewal Agency, June, 1957.

Report on Urban Renewal in Cleveland, September, 1955. Cleveland: The Advertising Club, 1955.

The Central Areas Social Study. Cleveland: Welfare Federation of Cleveland, 1954.

Articles

Hatcher, Flora Y. "The Role of Social Work in Urban Renewal." Housing and Home Finance Agency, (n.d.).

White, Clyde. "The New and Old in Community Development," National Social Work Journal. Vol. 3, No. 3 (July, 1958), 49-58.

Unpublished Material

"Dike School Project Report." Cleveland: Friendly Inn Settlement, Nov., 1955. (Mimeographed.)

Files of the Longwood Village Community Center, Friendly Inn Settlement, Cleveland, Ohio.

"Friendly Inn Settlement - Purpose and Functions." Cleveland: Friendly Inn Settlement, (n.d.). (Mimeographed.)

"Manual for the Members of the Board of Governors of the Friendly Inn Social Settlement." Cleveland: Friendly Inn Settlement, July 16, 1952.

Blake, Charles T. "The Origin and Activities of the Friendly Inn Settlement." Cleveland: Friendly Inn Settlement, January, 1959. (Mimeographed.)

"Longwood Village Tenant Rent Strike," (Boards and appropriate committees of the Cleveland Community Relations Board, the Cleveland NAACP, and the Urban League of Cleveland, October 27, 1958). (Mimeographed.)

"By-Laws of the Group Work Council of the Welfare Federation of Cleveland." Cleveland: Welfare Federation of Cleveland, February 1, 1952. (Mimeographed.)